

OFFICIAL

QSOFT.010A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT  
RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 14 2004

Applicant : Aronoff, et al.  
Appl. No. : 09/782,586  
Filed : February 12, 2001  
For : SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR  
RECONCILING TRANSACTIONS  
BETWEEN A REPLICATION  
SYSTEM AND A RECOVERED  
DATABASE  
Examiner : Chongshan Chen  
Group Art Unit : 2172

CERTIFICATE OF FAX TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all  
linked attachments are being facsimile transmitted to  
the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown  
below:

6/14/04  
(Date)  
John R. King, Reg. No. 34,362

RESPONSE TO MARCH 9, 2004 OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In order to prepare for the upcoming interview scheduled on June 16, 2004 at 11:30 a.m., the Examiner has requested that we submit an agenda regarding the matters to be discussed.

In brief, we plan on discussing the differences between the cited references and the invention. In particular, we plan on discussing how U.S. Patent No. 6,151,607 to Lomet (the "Lomet patent") and how U.S. Patent No. 6,289,357 to Parker (the "Parker patent") do not describe the process of synchronizing a target system with a source system during recovery of the target.

While a number of differences exist, generally speaking the Parker patent reconciles a source database with a target database; however, Parker does not describe how to reconcile the source and target if the target goes off-line and then needs to be recovered.

While the Lomet patent discusses how to recover a database, Lomet does not describe how to then reconcile the recovered database with another database.

The difficulty of reconciling a source database with a recovered database is that the recovery process is not typically complete. That is, the recovery process recovers a target database to a specific point in time where certain reconcile transactions have been applied and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

others have not. The reconcile process then needs to identify which transactions were applied to the recovered database and which transactions were not applied to the recovered database.

In order for the reconcile process to function properly, the reconcile process determines which transactions were applied to the recovered database and then purges the stale reconcile transactions from the reconcile process.

Neither of the cited references describes how to ensure that the reconcile process does not apply stale transactions to a recovered database.


We look forward to conducting the interview. In addition, William Romine, a software developer that works for Quest Software plans on attending the interview. If you have any other questions, please call me at 949-721-2998.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 6/14/04

By:

  
John R. King  
Registration No. 34,362  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\URK\URK-8336.DOC  
061004

BEST AVAILABLE COPY